

not an asbestos/lagger;
did the observers who believed the 50,000 was a successful sum
include any victims of asbestos
it wasnt simply to achieve publicity but to have the judge make
some form of ruling in regard to punitive damages
it wasnt reported by Kelman that £68000 had been mentioned
Robin Thompson's lawyer, Ms Dandridge had advised Mr McCrystal
that 10% was the sum to be returned
there were 8/10? asbestos victims in the group, a couple of whom
had already received out of court settlements; no victim of
asbestosis ever received court hearing. why?
the point was being argued that the sole purpose is compensation.
The great deal of work referred to by Mr Maguire is precisely the
work that must be undertaken to win a victim DSS entitlements -
and use the ~~Sawers~~ case as example, with George Moore and Dr
Monie's testimony.
We knew there was no more evidence to be heard, this is to miss
the point of court ruling. We are aware the figure is not
plucked out of the air, unless Mr Maguire is referring to the
£100,000 which his firm always submit in the knowledge it is not
a reasonable sum
what cases have proceeded?
the asbestos victim cannot unilaterally change the rules, does
this refer to the search for justice; change of rules equate with
justice; it wasnt the demand to hear evidence.
Total commitment
Maguire seeks congratulations for the award in matter of months

GMB recognises the problems the present legal system. I reported
the 10% figure. £200 administration fee?
GMB's involvement came about by request of Robin Thompson
achieving compensation is not the same thing as achieving justice
£2,834,000 compensation for 1644 members

EDD16
959-8027
332-3651